

v. *McCurry*, 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980)); see *I.A.M. Nat'l Pension Fund v. Indus. Gear Mfg. Co.*, 723 F.2d 944, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (noting that *res judicata* “forecloses all that which might have been litigated previously”). Plaintiff’s claim was adjudicated in a prior action in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which this Court previously found to have preclusive effect. See *Jenson v. Heurta*, Nos. 10-1071, 11-999 & 11-1180 (ABJ), — F. Supp. 2d —, 2011 WL 6145522 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2011) (dismissing plaintiff’s three consolidated actions stemming from the air traffic controllers’ pay dispute as barred by claim preclusion). Therefore, the Court will dismiss this repetitive action with prejudice.¹

An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: 6/5/12



United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff is warned that his filing of repetitive actions may result ultimately in the imposition of sanctions barring him from the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis* and/or restricting his ability altogether to file a civil action in this Court. See, e.g., *Hurt v. Social Security Admin.*, 544 F.3d 308, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2008).